

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview at August 21, 2006 at which the issue of new matter was discussed. The Examiner suggested that rather than deleting SEQ ID NOS. corresponding to figures omitted when the application was filed, applicants should add back the figures under the doctrine of incorporation by reference from provisional application 60/168,854 filed December 2, 1999. It was noted that the application papers as originally filed claimed priority from 60/168,854 (see second page of transmittal) and the application contained a statement incorporating by reference all patent references referred to herein (see p. 85 last paragraph).

Accordingly, applicants are adding the figures from the '854 provisional, and providing a second substitute sequence listing including the sequences from the figures. Because of the incorporation of figures from the provisional, it is no longer necessary to delete SEQ ID NOS. from the specification or the reference to the figures. Therefore, applicants provide a substitute specification identical to the application as originally filed. Although 37 CFR 1.125(c) specifies that applicants should provide a mark-up of the substitute specification relative to the immediate prior version, it is respectfully submitted that no purposes is served by providing such a mark-up in this case because it can more readily be seen that no new matter is involved from the fact that the substitute specification is identical to the specification as filed. A petition is being filed concurrently under 37 CFR 1.183 to waive the rules in this respect.

The substitute specification is identical to the originally filed specification and thus involves no new matter. The added drawings are identical to those in the '854 provisional and also involve no new matter. The sequences in the second substitute sequence listing are identical to those in the specification and drawings and also involve no new matter. The computer readable form contains sequences identical to the paper copy and involves no new matter.

One paragraph at p. 65, line 9 of the substitute specification is amended to correct a typographical error in printing of a restriction map.

The substitute specification has also been amended to introduce SEQ ID NOS. for sequences not previously assigned SEQ ID NOS.

Claim 22 has been amended to clarify the recitation of a phenyl group. Support is provided by original claim 6.

The SEQ ID NOS. assigned sequences have changed due to the additional sequences in the new sequence listing. Several claims have been amended to update the SEQ ID NO. according to the substitute sequence listing.

Applicants now turn to the issues raised in the office action using the paragraph numbering of the office action.

4. The Examiner says the specification still refers to specific fragments of beta secretase without providing sequence identifiers. The Examiner also says the previous marked up copy of the specification is not consistent with the clean copy. These comments are moot in view of the submission of a further substitute specification identical to the application as filed.

5. The Examiner objects to the deletion of SEQ ID NOS. As being new matter. The issue is moot in view of the submission of a substitute specification that does not delete SEQ ID NOS.

6. Claim 22 stands rejected as it is not clear which term the phenyl group refers to. Claim 22 has been amended for greater clarity.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Joe Liebeschuetz
Reg. No. 37,505

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300

Amendments to the Drawings:

Please enter Figs. 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4, 5, 6A, 6B, 7-12, 13A-13E, 14, 15A, 15B, 16A, 16B, 17A, 17B, and 18-21 from the appendix.

DRAWINGS APPENDIX